

to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MONTROYA, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. PEARSON, and Mr. COTTON conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation and the appreciation of the entire Senate to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTROYA) for the splendid manner in which this important funding measure was handled. His clear and convincing presentation, his strong advocacy, his careful preparation assured its overwhelming acceptance by the Senate. This was only characteristic. Senator MONTROYA has distinguished his entire public career with his outstanding legislative skill and ability.

The same may be said of the distinguished Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON), the ranking minority member of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee. He cooperated to make certain that this measure received the full yet efficient consideration of the Senate. We are grateful.

We are grateful also for the views of others who joined the discussion adding their own sincere and helpful comments. Noteworthy was the outstanding contribution of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIER). The success of his amendment was based in large measure on his able and effective advocacy. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) also is to be commended. His views are always most welcome as are those of the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Finally, the Senate may be pleased today with its action in disposing of another of the all important funding measures. There are others to be considered and I would hope that the entire appropriations process will be completed at the earliest possible time.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this evening, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPORT EXPANSION AND REGULATION ACT OF 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 329, S. 2696. I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2696) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation and expansion of exports, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield, so that I may inquire as to the future business for this week?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I say that it is with a great deal of personal reluctance that I call up S. 2696 at this time. However, because of the bareness of the calendar, I really do not have much choice, and I never want this Congress to be accused of being a foot-dragging Congress.

After we dispose of this bill, which may well go into Thursday, it is the intention to take up the veterans education bill, which was reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare today.

That is about as much as I can say at the moment.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator will yield further, aside from commenting—I do not know of any three words I have ever used that got so much action, and I am very pleased that the Senate is engaged in a considerable flurry of activity—the distinguished majority leader knows that I inquired of him as to whether or not some other bill could be substituted for this, simply because there are Senators on both sides who may not find it possible to be here tomorrow. But I understand that the reason for laying down this bill is that there does not appear to be another bill which could be substituted, and we had this discussion so that this might be brought out.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader almost broke my right arm, the distinguished assistant minority leader almost broke my left arm, various Senators from Utah, Texas, and other places almost broke my back, but I do not have much choice.

Mr. SCOTT. I think the junior Senator from Maine is also absent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. He had his arm around my neck, as well as the Senator from Minnesota and a few others.

OEO LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, on last Tuesday a situation occurred in the Senate that confused some of my colleagues, amazed others, startled me, may I say, and I rise at this point to try to put the RECORD straight and eliminate confusion as far as I am able to do so. I also wish to thank some of my colleagues for their defense of me and my position after I had left the Chamber.

Mr. President, you may recall that last Tuesday S. 3061 was suddenly and unexpectedly laid before the Senate as the order of business. I had suggested that the bill be put over to give me and other

Senators on the minority side the time to properly prepare some amendments. However, for some reason the bill was laid before the Senate very quickly and at the moment I was not prepared. We did the best we could to accommodate the acting majority leader in his determination to bring the bill before the Senate.

I had pointed out that I had long standing commitments in California that I just could not break, and which made it impossible for me to remain in the Chamber through the full session on Tuesday. I explained that as well as I could, and I explained that I had tried to have prepared two amendments that I wanted to introduce that had not been completed because we had not had the warning time. I do not think the situation was healthy, proper, or sound.

One amendment had to do with the legal service program in the bill, S. 3061. I thought I had explained it carefully. I understood the legal service program to mean actually what the term implies, that is, to provide a lawyer and legal services for a poor man who could not afford them. I said that somewhere along the line the provision for legal services had become legal reform and that all sorts of things were going on not only in my State but also in many other States, and that my amendment would have permitted two things. It would have restored the Governor's veto over this particular function without the OEO Director's override. Also, it would have provided the Governors with permission to veto line items. In the past there has been a habit of jumping the entire OEO program together and although one may object to only one or two items, the entire program would have to be vetoed. This did not seem to be practical and did not seem to be producing the desired results. So my amendment was introduced to accomplish two things.

I would like the RECORD to show that in the beginning, when the OEO program was first started, the Governors of the separate States had an unencumbered right to veto; and, then, in the second year, 1965, the right of the Governors to veto was significantly weakened, because the Director was given the power to override the Governor's veto. This has caused problems.

During committee hearings I said on several occasions that I would attempt to introduce an amendment that would clarify the original intent of the legal service program, which was simply to provide a lawyer for some poor guy who did not have enough money to hire a lawyer, and that if it was the feeling of the committee that taxpayers' money should be used for the purpose of legal reform, we should hold hearings and come to a decision, and perhaps bring it before this body. Certainly, in my opinion and in my judgment it was not proper to substitute legal reform for what started out to be legal services.

Tuesday my amendment was brought up. There was a rollcall vote and my amendment was agreed to by a vote of 45 to 40. At that point I was forced to leave the Chamber to keep my appointments in my State of California.

After I left the Chamber there was a